

Interview Summary

A) A Brief Description Of The Nature Of Any Exhibit Shown Or Any Demonstration Conducted:

Applicant's attorney provided to the Examiners (Freda Nelson and Thomas Dixon) and discussed the following documents, copies of which are attached hereto:

Exhibit A: Marked up copy of the independent claims highlighting language to be discussed.

Exhibit B: Five drawings of sample parts that have been quoted by Applicants' process.

Exhibit C: Figs. 1-5 from Abraham U.S. Patent 5,570,292.

Exhibit D: Marked up copy of pages 25 – 28 of Applicants' most recent amendment.

Exhibit E: Chart entitled "QuickQuote Adoption" showing growth in Applicants' quotation business using the present invention, plus a second page showing some of the companies who are now customers for Applicants' services.

B) Identification Of The Claims Discussed.

Applicant's attorney discussed the independent claims 1, 31, 52, 70, 71, 72 and 73.

C) Identification Of Specific Prior Art Discussed.

Abraham U.S. Patent No. 5,570,292.

D) Identification Of The Principal Proposed Amendments

See discussion in part E below re amendment to clarify that the file originates with a customer.

E) The General Thrust Of The Principal Arguments

Applicants' attorney used Exhibits A – D to illustrate the point that Applicants' system allows the customer to input a CAD file of the customer's origination and to obtain an instantaneous price quote for manufacture of the custom manufactured part described in the customer's file. Applicants' attorney contrasted that to the Abraham system which only allows customers to select designs from a menu of available designs originated by the manufacturer, and which does not allow a customer to input their own CAD file to obtain a quote for a design of their own origination. At most all the Abraham customer can do is cause the Abraham program to change the size of the menu selected design and in some instances change the profile of the design to a geometrical shape available from the menu. The claim language previously presented had characterized the customer's CAD files as describing a part of "arbitrary shape".

In view of that argument the Examiners agreed that in substance all of the claims would be allowable over the Abraham reference, but the Examiners suggested that instead of referring to the files as describing a part of "arbitrary shape" the claims should be clarified by using the term "customer" rather than

“client” so that it is clear that the claims are referring to a file originated by the customer. The Examiners also requested that an explanation be provided for the support found in the specification for those amendments.

F) A General Indication Of Any Other Pertinent Matters Discussed

The Examiners’ also requested that Applicants summarize the argument presented in the previous amendment regarding the previously filed Rule 131 Declaration and its application to the Protomold.com reference.

One of the Applicants, Mr. Ron Hollis, briefly discussed the commercial success of the invention with reference to Exhibit E.

G) General Results Of The Interview

It was agreed that in substance independent claims 1, 31, 52 and 70 – 73 were allowable over the Abraham et al U.S. Patent No. 5,570,292 reference with the clarifying amendment discussed above.